

4-28-67

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I didn't get the book you were supposed to put out in February. If it hasn't been mailed yet, that's all right. But if it has been, my copy must be lost.

I am disturbed to learn, if the May 6, 1967, Post story by James Phelan is accurate, that Jim Garrison is a rabid Ayn Rand fan. In my experience those people turn out to rightwingers. I am also disturbed to learn, if it is so, that Garrison has the notion that this was a "homosexual" conspiracy. There is no such thing. The Loeb-Leopold case, to which he has supposedly compared it, was a purely private murder with folie a deux psychological causes. Kennedy's was a political murder. And if as Garrison is supposed to have said, Kennedy was killed because he was "virile, handsome, and successful," that's just crackpot ~~psych~~ psychology. Kennedy cast a singularly harmless ~~xxxxx~~ almost sexless image. Those queens' imagination get to work on men like Brando. Kennedy didn't do a thing for them. If there were homosexuals involved they wouldn't have been involved as homosexuals.

Oswald's association with gay boys in N.O. was probably like his associations with other "disreputables". He, whether he knew the purpose or not, probably had his orders to associate himself with elements generally considered disreputable to the American people. Those shaggy Castro radicals - that bunch of queers, you know. The fact of the FPCC stamp being put in the Manchester biography as early as midsummer 1963 shows that the conspirators at that time had in mind that Oswald would be blamed for the murder of the president; and that the FPCC would share in the blame; so somebody got the bright idea of having him associate with queers too. These conspirators liked insurance. Then the object was probably to bring off an invasion of Cuba. That fell through because of its sheer improbability and because Oswald was arrested before being murdered. That necessitated a change in plans and the conspirators thought it was safest to go with the lone assassin theory. That didn't work thanks to their blundering and the blundering of the government agencies and the demolition work of the critics. Now things are getting hot again and they have had second thoughts. Maybe they have decided to go back to the old plot which they had all laid out - the pro-castro radicals, FPCC and all that old ~~xxxxxxx~~ flimflam. The false trail they laid in advance of the assassination would still be there. Anyway, I have feared from the first that the N.O. investigation was an attempt to go back, not to the truth, but to that false trail which I believe was the conspirator's original plan: to blame it on Castro, and hit Cuba. You will probably recall that Henry Wade's testimony makes it clear that there was a very strong movement on foot in ~~xx~~ Dallas right after Oswald's arrest to charge Oswald with Murder with Conspiracy. And finally it took, apparently, some phone calls from Washington ~~xxx~~ says from the "White House" - which would be the Kennedy's - but it may have been the new President's party which put the quietus on it. "White House" is vague.


Anyway, Wade said several times they wanted to file on Oswald for murder with conspiracy, which is damn funny considering the record doesn't show Oswald was ever asked one word about a conspiracy. And Ruby popping up and explaining what FPCC stood for is twice as funny, considering that there is not one chance in ten thousand that he would have known the exact name of that organization when even Henry Wade didn't know it and it wasn't operative in Dallas - not unless he had been primed on it in advance. So the original plot had to be to make the pro-Castro left the fall guy with Oswald the star.

And so I am very disturbed to learn about Garrison's predilection for the nutty ideas of Ayn Rand.

I read that Mark Lane was in N.O. and saying Garrison really had the stuff; but I don't know that Lane is such a great thinker. I wish I knew if you were there. I would feel a whole lot better.

To me, a lot of the stories coming out of there sound like the same old staged stuff we found so much of the Commission proceedings - people pretending to be for Castro one day and against the next (Ferrie); Oswald sitting and stroking a gun with a telescopic sight (just as Marina testified). There was an awful lot of theatrical hocus-pocus prior to the assassination, and some of information from New Orleans sounds like more of the same. There was a convincing story out of Belgium, too, that a "Russian" sailor mouthed around before the assassination that the reds would kill Kennedy before Christmas and supposedly a letter was sent to the White House on Nov. 19, 1963, to that effect. (I read that in Atlas this month.) And that sounds like more stage setting to blame it on the reds, in advance. I hope nobody is naive enough to think the reds would leave such a great trail, and so many little trails, to themselves if they were contemplating an assassination, especially one this big. Who laid this interesting trail back to the reds? Had to be somebody big enough with

I hope you are well and everything is all right. *plenty of connections -*

  
Beverly Brunson

I sincerely wish you would find time to tell me whether that white object on the hood of the VP limosine in the Altgens photo has been altered from the Altgens published in the Dec. 13 Post, 1963. I still think it has. And if it has, it must have been altered for a reason. And I still think I'm right about the firecrackers, etc. But I haven't talked about it at all to anyone but you. And I don't talk about you either, in case you think I might be some nut who goes around dropping your name. I do not.